



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,562	03/21/2001	Tadahiro Uehara	826.1705/JDH	2631
21171	7590	11/16/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ZHEN, LI B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/812,562

Applicant(s)

UEHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
MEN-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In response to the Final-Office action mailed on June 7, 2004, applicant argues:

- (1) there is no disclosure or suggestion in McKeehan that there be plural such CacheManagers [p. 7, lines 27 - 28];
- (2) there is no disclosure or suggestion concerning switching or substituting CacheManagers [p. 7, lines 29 - 30];
- (3) there is no disclosure or suggestion concerning switching or substituting one PersistentContainer for another [p. 8, lines 1 - 2]; and
- (4) a method in McKeehan refers to a function associated with a class while a method of the present invention corresponds to a particular component and not several components [p. 8, lines 2 - 6].

As to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the prior art suggests that there is a plurality of CacheManagers because McKeehan teaches a plurality of PersistentContainers [e.g., col. 19, lines 1 - 14] and that each PersistentContainer includes a CacheManager [e.g., col. 19, lines 15 - 23].

As to arguments (2) and (3), examiner notes that the framework extension [e.g., col. 18, lines 48 - 67] and subclassing [e.g., col. 19, line 50 - col. 20, line 5] of McKeehan would read on the switching of the present invention because the extension process select specific core classes and extends the from the core classes to define new classes that support a specific persistent storage [e.g., col. 22, lines 1 - 22].

In response to argument (4), examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the methods in a class of McKeehan perform the data managing method of the present invention [e.g., col. 20, lines 13 - 30]. The method of McKeehan also corresponds to a particular component, the component being an instance of the class that the method belongs to. In addition, McKeehan also describes defining specific steps and their order needed to provide a variety of different persistent storage environments [e.g., col. 18, lines 9 - 20].